

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELIAS STAVRINIDES,

No. C 15-03118 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER RE RECENTLY  
RECEIVED LETTER**

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
COMPANY,


Defendant.

The Court is in receipt of a letter from plaintiff requesting to reopen his case. After several warnings, an October 29 order dismissed plaintiff's case for failure to prosecute (Dkt. No. 27). Defendant PG&E had filed a motion to dismiss on September 4, to which plaintiff failed to respond. Magistrate Judge Kandis Westmore, who then presided over the case, issued an order for plaintiff to show cause, by October 15, as to why he did not timely respond to defendant's motion (Dkt. No. 18). Plaintiff did not respond to that order. The case was then reassigned to the undersigned judge. A second order to show cause requested that plaintiff show cause, in writing, why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute by noon on October 27. The order warned that failure to respond, or to show sufficient cause as to why plaintiff has not responded to previous orders, would result in dismissal of the case for failure to prosecute (Dkt. No. 26). Plaintiff again failed to file any response.

1 Plaintiff's recent letter simply states that he did not know he needed to respond to  
2 defendant's motion to dismiss and says that he changed residences on October 10 (two weeks  
3 after Judge Westmore issued the first OSC). Moreover, plaintiff's letter still does contain any  
4 opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss, which both OSCs requested. Despite multiple  
5 warnings that the case would be dismissed, plaintiff has taken no steps to prosecute this case  
6 since he filed it in July. Plaintiff's request is **DENIED**.

7  
8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9  
10 Dated: November 17, 2015.

11   
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 WILLIAM ALSUP  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28